

Risk	Treatment	Mitigation type	Probability 1-5 (Pre mitigation)	Impact 1-5 (Pre mitigation)	Risk Score (Pre mitigation)	Contingency value (post mitigation)	Phase in the Programme where the Risk may Occur					
							Design and Mobilisation (Feb 19 - Aug 19)	Design, Build & PIT (Aug 19 - May 20)	Testing (May 20 - Dec 20)	Transition (Dec 20 - May 21)	Go Live (May 21 - Jun 21)	Early Life Support (May 21 - Sep 21)
There is a risk that geopolitical change, e.g. Brexit, may lead to the cancellation of the Switching Programme.	Accept		1	4	4		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Geopolitical risk, e.g. Brexit, may make it difficult to obtain the services required due to the impact on service providers.	Accept		1	4	4		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that good practice from other programmes is limited to one or two examples and other examples may be overlooked.	Mitigate	Communication; stakeholder management; governance	2	1	2		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that the contracts with Existing Service Providers (ESPs) may be misaligned in terms of deadlines, incentives or requirements.	Mitigate	Contract alignment; requirements alignment; assurance reviews; planning and delivery management	2	2	4		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that with different organisations undertaking reporting in the overall programme that the reported status of activities may be misaligned leading to additional work required to confirm the true status of any activities.	Mitigate	Programme Coordination; PMO; governance	3	1	3		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk of new REC obligations that DCC cannot meet.	Mitigate	Change control processes; governance	3	2	6		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that Existing Service Providers (ESPs) fail to cooperate or deliver (despite best efforts) to the detailed timetable set out by the Systems Integrator or overall Programme Plan.	Transfer		2	5	10		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk of conflict of interest arising were one company in the Switching eco-system takes over another that is intended to be independent of that company.	Accept		1	1	1		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that the activities of the Switching Programme team at DCC are not appreciated or valued by industry and that additional effort will be required to ensure the industry is on board with DCC's role on the programme.	Mitigate	governance; coordination and planning; stakeholder management	1	1	1		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that the Systems Integrator or new service providers lower the priority of activities that are not strictly related to a payment milestone acceptance.	Mitigate	Contract management; requirements management; supplier relationship management; delivery management/assurance	3	2	6		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lack of agreement on Entry and Exit criteria for each stage of the programme.	Mitigate	Programme Coordination; System Integration; governance	2	4	8		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that organisations involved in the programme may use different reporting toolsets, leading to increased effort being taken up on reporting and hence delay the programme or increase costs.	Mitigate	Programme Coordination; System Integration	2	1	2		Yes	No	No	No	No	No

Risk	Treatment	Mitigation type	Probability 1-5 (Pre mitigation)	Impact 1-5 (Pre mitigation)	Risk Score (Pre mitigation)	Contingency value (post mitigation)	Phase in the Programme where the Risk may Occur					
							Design and Mobilisation (Feb 19 - Aug 19)	Design, Build & PIT (Aug 19 - May 20)	Testing (May 20 - Dec 20)	Transition (Dec 20 - May 21)	Go Live (May 21 - Jun 21)	Early Life Support (May 21 - Sep 21)
There is a risk that there is insufficient time to fully carry out mobilisation of activities for each service provider, or that there are differing expectations between those providers leading to increased dependency on each other, and a slower start to the programme.	Mitigate	Programme Coordination; System Integration	2	2	4		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that the Central Switching Service provider cannot respond to changes to the scope of the solution, including additional adaptability expectations.	Mitigate	Contract management; requirements management; supplier relationship management; delivery assurance; change control	2	2	4		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that functional changes for the solution will be identified, in order for it to meet the overall requirements resulting in additional time and cost.	Mitigate	Contract management; requirements management; supplier relationship management; change control	3	5	15		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is an opportunity to be seen as the centre of design expertise by providing continued management of the E2E design on behalf of Ofgem.	Exploit		4	1	4		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that delays in agreeing the design may cause the programme to be delayed.	Mitigate	Programme Coordination; governance	3	4	12		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that a lack of coordination between the Systems Integrator and Programme Coordinator activities leads to inefficiencies in the programme.	Mitigate	Contract management; requirements management; supplier relationship management; delivery assurance;	3	2	6		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that there is over-scrutiny of DCC by the Programme Coordinator which detracts from delivering the solution causing potential delays.	Mitigate	Governance; requirements management;	2	2	4		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that the Licenced Party Assurance Provider and the Core Systems Assurance Provider use different processes and techniques and that Ofgem / Programme Coordinator may look to introduce changes to the scope of the Core Systems Assurance provider leading to additional cost.	Transfer		1	1	1		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that governance groups/Programme Coordinator create conflicting priorities and this leads to delays and reprioritisation of some activities.	Mitigate	Governance; requirements management; planning	3	3	9		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that the co-location space is unavailable when needed and this leads to a delay in mobilisation activities.	Mitigate	Contract management; planning	1	1	1		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that the SMS service provider may be unable to complete its detailed design on time.	Mitigate	Procurement; contract management	4	3	12		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that Existing Service Providers (ESP) costs increase once the Service Management Interface design is known.	Share		1	3	3		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that the enduring REC will not be designated on time leading to a delay to Go Live.	Transfer		1	5	5		no	No	No	No	yes	yes

Values recorded

Risk	Treatment	Mitigation type	Probability 1-5 (Pre mitigation)	Impact 1-5 (Pre mitigation)	Risk Score (Pre mitigation)	Contingency value (post mitigation)	Phase in the Programme where the Risk may Occur					
							Design and Mobilisation (Feb 19 - Aug 19)	Design, Build & PIT (Aug 19 - May 20)	Testing (May 20 - Dec 20)	Transition (Dec 20 - May 21)	Go Live (May 21 - Jun 21)	Early Life Support (May 21 - Sep 21)
There is a risk that there are unidentified assumptions made on the part of the SI or service providers that emerge later in the programme which may impact the ability to deliver on time or to cost.	Mitigate	Contract management; requirements management; supplier relationship management; delivery management/assurance;	3	3	9	d u e t o c o m m e r c i a l c o n f i d e	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that the Existing Service Providers (ESP) do not provide test environments as required by the Systems Integrator Environment Plan.	Mitigate	System integration; stakeholder management	2	5	10		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that service providers may have assumed that other organisations are carrying out a service for which that service provider is responsible.	Mitigate	Contract management; requirements management; supplier relationship management; delivery management/assurance;	2	2	4		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that the Communication Network requirements may not be met due to our inability to influence the design of the network as we are only "users" of the network.	Mitigate	Governance; escalation; commercial agreement	1	5	5		No	Yes	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that simulation tools are not compatible with ESP Test environments and approaches.	Mitigate	System integration; stakeholder management; contract management	1	1	1		No	Yes	No	No	No	No
There is risk that new service providers may try to introduce Vendor lock-in by using proprietary tools/ knowledge/ processes.	Mitigate	Contract management	1	3	3		No	Yes	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that new manual activities may be required in operations that are not planned for.	Mitigate	Procurement assurance; contract management; requirements management	1	1	1		No	Yes	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that data used for the population of CSS is insufficient to enable a direct transfer of data to CSS, and a further manipulation or data cleanse is required leading to increased costs or timescales.	Mitigate	Programme Coordination; governance; system integration; stakeholder management	4	4	16		No	Yes	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that data migration approaches and activities focus on technical activities and do not consider business/operational initiatives.	Mitigate	Programme Coordination; governance; system integration; stakeholder management	2	2	4		No	Yes	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that defects are found in the E2E solution which due to the complexity of the integrated solution makes it difficult to identify the underlying cause leading to delays and cost increases.	Mitigate	system integration; stakeholder management; delivery assurance	2	5	10		No	No	Yes	No	No	No
There is a risk that the SI and CSS provider bypass agreement with DCC and commit to expenditure or activities that are not justified.	Mitigate	Contract management	1	3	3		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that key staff will be lost during the DBT phase leading to cost over-runs or delays.	Mitigate	Resource management; business planning; succession planning	3	2	6		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that the integration of the Central Switching Service with the Smart Metering Network introduces a security risk that is considered unacceptable by SEC or NCSC.	Mitigate	Programme Coordination; governance; stakeholder management	3	5	15	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	

Risk	Treatment	Mitigation type	Probability 1-5 (Pre mitigation)	Impact 1-5 (Pre mitigation)	Risk Score (Pre mitigation)	Contingency value (post mitigation)	Phase in the Programme where the Risk may Occur					
							Design and Mobilisation (Feb 19 - Aug 19)	Design, Build & PIT (Aug 19 - May 20)	Testing (May 20 - Dec 20)	Transition (Dec 20 - May 21)	Go Live (May 21 - Jun 21)	Early Life Support (May 21 - Sep 21)
There is a risk that the PIT or SIT phases over-run as a result of being unable to satisfy any requirements imposed on the CSS solution.	Mitigate	system integration; planning; requirements assurance; programme coordination	3	4	12	n t i a l i t y	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that additional security constraints may be added to the solution leading to a change in requirements and hence longer timescales will be required.	Mitigate	Change control processes; governance; design assurance	1	3	3		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that Security Compliance Audits may not be completed due to lack of cooperation from participants (for whatever reason).	Mitigate	Programme Coordination; governance; stakeholder management	1	2	2		Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Despite best efforts, there is a risk that Contractor underperformance leads to termination of the contract with one of the CSS providers or the SI.	Mitigate	Contract management; delivery assurance	1	5	5		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that a legal challenge may occur relating to a breach of IPR which causes a delay to the programme.	Mitigate	contract management; supplier relationship management; legal	1	3	3		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that a legal challenge may occur relating to a breach of GDPR which causes a delay to the programme.	All	contract management; supplier relationship management; legal	1	5	5		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that financial failure of one of the service providers may lead to delays or increased programme costs (the impact would be different depending on the stage of the programme or the service provider concerned and would need to be assessed individually).	Mitigate	contract management; supplier relationship management;	1	5	5		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk of incompatibility in the contractor solutions due to working practices, delivery approach or technical issues.	Mitigate	contract management; supplier relationship management; delivery assurance/management	1	3	3		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that data is lost during the Transition of the data from the Existing Service Providers.	Mitigate	system integration; requirements assurance; delivery assurance; programme coordination	1	3	3		No	No	No	Yes	No	No
There is a risk that communications from the Switching Programme conflicts with messages from the Programme Coordinator or Systems Integrator leading to reputational damage.	Mitigate	governance; coordination and planning; stakeholder management	2	2	4		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that external factors reduce the programme business case leading to programme termination.	Transfer		1	4	4		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk of design misalignment between the Design Authority, contract and the REC.	Mitigate	Governance; Stakeholder Management; Programme Coordination; Requirements Assurance; Change Control	3	3	9		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
There is a risk in terms of costs that DCC cannot maintain a 75:25 staff:contractor ratio.	Mitigate	Matrix management; resourcing	2	2	4		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
There is a risk that the programme may be unable to fill relevant roles on the programme structure with suitable qualified and able professionals.	Mitigate	Matrix management; resourcing	2	3	6		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that the Governance procedures in place may not be able to resolve issues in a timely manner leading to delays on the programme.	Mitigate	Programme Coordination; governance; stakeholder management; system integrator	3	3	9	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Risk	Treatment	Mitigation type	Probability 1-5 (Pre mitigation)	Impact 1-5 (Pre mitigation)	Risk Score (Pre mitigation)	Contingency value (post mitigation)	Phase in the Programme where the Risk may Occur					
							Design and Mobilisation (Feb 19 - Aug 19)	Design, Build & PIT (Aug 19 - May 20)	Testing (May 20 - Dec 20)	Transition (Dec 20 - May 21)	Go Live (May 21 - Jun 21)	Early Life Support (May 21 - Sep 21)
There is a risk that further, additional work will be required to ensure that service design documents and process flows are at a level of detail which was not anticipated within the plan.	Share		2	4	8		Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that the selected CSS Contractor may lack the security expertise required to develop a physical solution architecture that addresses the security concerns of stakeholders such as the NCSC, SEC Panel, DCC and BEIS, leading to rework higher delivery costs and potential Programme delay.	Mitigate	requirements assurance; contract management	1	3	3		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Given that the CSS must connect to the Smart Metering Data Service Provider (DSP) to deliver the Programme's benefit, there is a risk that stakeholders such as the NCSC, SEC Panel, DCC and BEIS could revise their view of the inherent risk of the CSS' connection to CNI, leading to re-work, higher delivery costs and potential Programme delay.	Mitigate	governance; stakeholder management; programme coordination; system integration; requirements assurance	2	5	10		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
There is a risk that the updated Information Risk Assessment (IRA) could require further elaboration of requirements during DBT, leading to re-work, risking agreed resourcing plans, contractual disputes and potential Programme delay.	Mitigate	change control; stakeholder management	1	3	3		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
There is a risk that internal and external stakeholders may not provide the necessary resources in order for the DCC Service Design Team to create the required e2e service design documents and process flows.	Mitigate	governance; stakeholder management; programme coordination; system integration	4	3	12		Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
There is a risk that during the design and build phase a number of unforeseen processes will be uncovered and will require additional work to develop manual workarounds.	Share		4	3	12		No	No	No	Yes	No	No
					Total	£ 10,555,000.00						

ID	Description	Impact Area	Status	Stability	Impact
1	It is assumed that the Data Transfer Network (DTN) and the IX network would be used as the Switching Communications Network	Procurement & DBT	Accepted	High	High
2	It is assumed that the CSSIA Plan needs to be baselined before DBT activities entry (Detailed Design Build and Test Phase) commences	DBT	Proposed	High	High
3	It is assumed that the Existing Service Providers will have all required internal business case and budget approval signed off in order to allow them to mobilise on plan	DBT	Proposed	High	High
4	It is assumed that the market participants will have the required internal business case and budget approval signed off in order to allow them to mobilise	DBT	Proposed	High	Low
5	It is assumed that not all market participants need to be mobilised prior to DBT start	DBT	Proposed	High	High
6	It is assumed that we can go live with the new switching service without all of the market participants being ready	Go Live	Proposed	High	High
7	It is assumed that the only interface element required to support pre-integration testing is a test simulator	PIT	Proposed	Medium	High
8	It is assumed that all Existing Service Providers will have data migration activity to undertake	DBT - Central Data Services	Proposed	Medium	Low
9	It is assumed that the Core Systems Assurance Provider will get copies of all relevant RAID logs and plans from the organisations it is providing assurance on	Core Systems Assurance Provider Delivery	Proposed	High	Low
10	It is assumed that there are enough market participants that have passed User Entry Process Testing (UEPT) to perform Formal End-to-End Testing prior to Stage 1 Transition.	Stage 1 Transition	Proposed	Medium	High
11	It is assumed that UEPT cannot commence until System Integration Testing (SIT) is complete	UEPT	Proposed	High	Medium
12	It is assumed that upon completion of Design Baseline 4, Existing Service Providers can undertake initial design work	DBT Start	Proposed	Medium	High
13	It is assumed that Existing Service Providers won't start any detailed design work until Physical Design Baseline is in place	PDB	Proposed	Medium	Low
14	It is assumed that the Existing Service Providers need delivery products updated in order to start DBT	DBT Start	Proposed	Medium	Low
15	It is assumed that there is sufficient information at DBT Start for the SI to commence design of the overall CSS Data Migration Solution (Extract, Transform, Load)	CSS Data Migration Solution	Proposed	Medium	Low
16	It is assumed that there will be a singular Go-No Go decision gateway	Go Live	Proposed	Medium	Medium
17	It is assumed that suppliers are able to manage and resolve critical defects from the critical tests in the timescales provided	Transition	Proposed	Medium	High

ID	Description	Impact Area	Status	Stability	Impact
18	It is assumed that there are no critical dependencies amongst the systems that would stop design and build activities occurring in parallel	DBT	Proposed	Medium	High
19	It is assumed that re-procurements of the DTN and IX Comms Networks will have been completed prior to DBT on the Comms Network	Comms Network DBT	Proposed	Medium	Medium

ID	Area	Level	Title	Category

There are currently no identified Issues prior to DBT. If any are identified during DBT these will be logged and managed in accordance with Programme Management controls.

ID	Organisation RECEIVING Dependency (GET)	Organisation DELIVERING Dependency (GIVE)	Service Area / Project	Description	Impact of Non Delivery
1	Systems Integrator	DCC	CSSIA	Final iteration of the Core Systems and Services Integration Approach (CSSIA) is dependent upon DCC procuring the CSS Provider who need to be selected in order to provide support.	Delay to the CSSIA being produced, which is required for DBT start. Would impact the timescales of the programme.
2	Systems Integrator	DCC	Delivery Products	Development of the end-to-end and CSS delivery products is dependent upon DCC procuring the CSS Provider who need to be selected in order to provide support.	Delay to the end-to-end and CSS delivery products being produced, which is required for DBT start. Would impact the timescales of the programme.
3	CSS Provider	DCC	CSS Provider Mobilisation	Mobilisation of the CSS Provider is dependent upon the contract signature for the CSS Provider.	Delay to DBT.
4	Existing Service Providers	Systems Integrator	DBT	DBT start for the Existing Service Providers is dependent upon the SI confirming the CSS Physical Interface Designs.	Delay to DBT.
5	CSS Provider	Systems Integrator	DBT	DBT start for the CSS Provider is dependent upon the SI confirming the CSS Physical Interface Designs.	Delay to DBT. The Registration Service is a critical task so this would have direct impact.
6	Market Participants	Systems Integrator	DBT	DBT start for the Market Participants is dependent upon the SI confirming the CSS Physical Interface Designs.	Assumed that there would be no impact, as Market Participants are not required for DBT start. However, some Market Participants are required for the initial wave of UEPT so could have an impact here if there is significant delay.
7	Existing Service Providers	Systems Integrator	Pre-IT	Completion of Pre-Integration for Existing Service Providers is dependent upon the SI providing a simulator tool for testing.	Delay to pre-integration testing, which could impact go-live date.
8	CSS Provider	Systems Integrator	Pre-IT	Completion of Pre-Integration for CSS Provider is dependent upon the SI providing a simulator tool for testing.	Delay to pre-integration testing. The Registration Service is on the critical path so will have a direct impact on the go-live date.
9	Market Participants	Systems Integrator	Pre-IT	Completion of Pre-Integration for all Market Participants is dependent upon the SI providing a simulator tool for testing.	Delay to pre-integration testing, which could impact go-live date.
10	Market Participants	Systems Integrator	UEPT	User Entry Process Testing is dependent upon the SI providing a UEPT Enabling Package.	Delay to UEPT, which is a critical task so would impact go-live date.
11	Market Participants	Systems Integrator	UEPT	User Entry Process Testing is dependent upon the SI successfully completing Systems Integration Testing.	Delay to UEPT, which is a critical task so would impact go-live date.
12	Systems Integrator	Market Participants	Formal E2E Testing	Formal end-to-end testing is dependent upon a sufficient number of Market Participants successfully completing UEPT.	Delay to formal end-to-end testing, which is a critical task so would impact go-live date.
13	Systems Integrator	Existing Service Providers	SIT	Systems Integration Testing is dependent upon the successful completion of the technological pre-integration testing from the Existing Service Providers.	Delay to SIT, which is a critical task so would impact go-live date.
14	Systems Integrator	CSS Provider	SIT	Systems Integration Testing is dependent upon the successful completion of the technological pre-integration testing from the CSS Provider.	Delay to SIT, which is a critical task so would impact go-live date.
15	Systems Integrator	Existing Service Providers	DMT	Data Migration Testing is dependent upon the successful completion of the data pre-integration testing from the Existing Service Providers.	Delay to DMT, which has the potential to impact go-live.

ID	Organisation RECEIVING Dependency (GET)	Organisation DELIVERING Dependency (GIVE)	Service Area / Project	Description	Impact of Non Delivery
16	Systems Integrator	CSS Provider	DMT	Data Migration Testing is dependent upon the successful completion of the data pre-integration testing from the CSS Provider(s).	Delay to DMT, which has the potential to impact go-live.
17	Systems Integrator	Existing Service Providers	Operational Testing	Operational Testing is dependent upon the successful completion of the service management pre-integration testing from the Existing Service Providers.	Delay to Operational Testing, which has the potential to impact go-live.
18	Systems Integrator	CSS Provider	Operational Testing	Operational Testing is dependent upon the successful completion of the service management pre-integration testing from the CSS Provider.	Delay to Operational Testing, which has the potential to impact go-live.